

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/716,740
Atty. Docket No. 5922R2C3
Amdt. Dated September 12, 2005
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1-18, 38-55, 75, 80, 81, and 86-102 remain in the instant Application. Claims 16, 19-37, 53, 56-74, 76-79, and 82-85 have been cancelled.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-11, 13-18, 38-48, 50-55, 75, 80, 81, 86-91 and 93-101 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilbur (US 2338749) in view of Reed et al, (US 4054697), and further in view of admitted prior art.

Independent claims 38 and 86 have each been amended to provide that the active side comprises a plurality of three dimensional non-adherent protrusions extending outwardly from said sheet of material and a pressure-sensitive adhesive surrounding said non-adherent protrusions, said adhesive having a thickness less than the height of said non-adherent protrusions before activation. Claims 16 and 53 have been cancelled.

The combination of Reed with Wilbur describes a sheet material of uncertain gauge having discrete particles applied over a continuous layer of adhesive. The particles of such a combination are not integral to the sheet as provided in independent claims 38 and 86. The gauge of the references is not provided and there is nothing in the references that teaches or suggests the claimed range of between about 0.0001 inches to about 0.002 inches. The combination of references fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations of the invention as claimed. The combination of references fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 USC §103(a). The rejection should be reconsidered in light of the current amendments and withdrawn.

Claims 12, 49, 92, and 102 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilbur (US 2338749) in view of admitted prior art, and further in view of Reed et al, (US 4054697) and Kovac (US 3819467)

As provided above, the combination of Wilbur and Reed fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 USC §103(a). The addition of Kovac does not cure the deficiencies of the combination. The expanded combination still fails to teach or suggest each of the limitations of the invention as claimed. The rejection should be reconsidered in view of the amended claims and withdrawn.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 09/716,740
Atty. Docket No. 5922R2C3
Amdt. Dated September 12, 2005
Customer No. 27752

CONCLUSION

Based on all the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that each of Applicants' remaining claims is in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
PETER W. HAMILTON, ET AL.



By: David K. Mattheis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,683
(513) 634-9359

September 12, 2005
Customer No. 27752